## Exhibit B

## Case 4:07-cv-05944-JST Document 3693-2 Filed 02/27/15 Page 2 of 5 $_1$

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS
3	IN RE:
4	
5	URETHANE ANTITRUST LITIGATION CASE NO. 04-1616
6	
7	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
9	before HONORABLE JOHN W. LUNGSTRUM
10	on DECEMBER 7, 2012
11	
12	APPEARANCES
13	For the Class Plaintiffs: Joseph Goldberg
14	Freedman, Boyd, Hollander, Goldberg & Ives PA
15	20 First Plaza, Suite 700 Albuquerque, NM 87102
16	Donald L. Perelman
17	Fine, Kaplan and Black, RPC One South Broad Street, Suite 2300
18	Philadelphia, PA 19107
19	Robert W. Coykendall Morris, Laing, Evans, Brock &
20	Kennedy, Chtd. 300 N. Mead St., Suite #200
21	Wichita, KS 67202-2745
22	Michael J. Guzman  Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans
23	& Figel, PLLC Sumner Square 1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400
24	Washington, DC 20036-3209
25	

1	THE COURT: Without objection and I hope
2	we can do this I'm going to take up Document
3	No. 2568, which has not been responded to, which
4	dealt with those two witnesses, and tell you here is
5	what I want you to do. That is, with regard to
6	Fischer, I want to make this clear. As of now what I
7	understand the situation is is that Dow has told the
8	plaintiff that Fischer does not appear to be
9	available live; therefore, he will be called by
10	videotaped deposition. However, if the parties
11	jointly are able to come to an accommodation for
12	Fischer to testify live, I will certainly honor that
13	accommodation, but that accommodation will require
14	that he testify live during the plaintiffs'
15	case-in-chief as well as the defendants' case. Is
16	that clear with regard to Fischer?
17	MR. GUZMAN: It is. Thank you, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Is that clear to you, Mr. Loeb?
19	MR. LOEB: I think so, your Honor. Thank
20	you.
21	THE COURT: Beitel's situation, clarify
22	that for me, if you would a little bit. I have lost
23	a little bit of track here. Is he under your
24	control, or is he a former also?
25	MR. LOEB: He's not. He's a former

employee who left Dow in 2004, but we are in contact with him, and he is planning to appear. So we don't have control, but we do have some contact, and we have that information about his willingness.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I have no idea what the circumstances may be with regard to Beitel's availability, but I tend to agree with the plaintiffs that he should — these witnesses should be in a position to testify live in both sides' cases if at all possible. So what I am directing Dow to do on this point is, in your dealings with Mr. Beitel, I want to impress upon him that we appreciate his willingness to come but that he needs to make himself available, perhaps, twice. The first time, of course, would be at the plaintiffs' expense, not at Dow's expense, but through your good offices in brokering his attendance. But I'm inclined to enforce the notion that he would need to testify live in both cases or by video in both cases. All right?

MR. LOEB: Your Honor, I understand the direction and the ruling. The comment I would make on this is two-fold: One is, we will certainly use our contacts with Mr. Beitel to assure that he's as available, according to the court's wishes and schedule, as possible. Secondly, it's our very

1 present their case as they feel they need to present 2 While it's good to be able to keep somebody from 3 having to make a second trip, and it's good in some respects, less confusing in editing videotapes and so 4 5 forth, perhaps, to have some continuity in the testimony; nonetheless, I think the primary objective 6 7 should be to permit the plaintiffs to have their day 8 in court, so to speak, to present their evidence the way they want to present it, and not have that 9 coopted by the defendants being permitted to cross 10 examine beyond the scope of the direct, as I say, except upon agreement of the parties to accommodate a witness or to deal with whatever other justification you all come to by yourselves. But when push comes to shove, if there's a disagreement, I'm going to lean to the side of allowing the plaintiffs to try their case the way they want to. So that's not a ruling; that's simply a guidance of where this will come down when the case -- when I have to make a ruling on that subject. All right. Anything else that we ought to do here today? Thank you very much for your appearances, and we will be in touch with you as things develop. We're in recess. (The telephone conference was adjourned.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25